

AZERBAIJAN

vii. The Iranian Language of Azerbaijan

Ādarī (Ar. *al-ādarīya*) was the Iranian language of Azerbaijan before the spread of the Turkish language, commonly called *Azeri*, in the region. The currency of *Ādarī* in Azerbaijan during the first centuries of the Islamic period is attested by contemporary sources. The earliest reference to *Ādarī* is the statement by Ebn al-Moqaffa' (d. 142/759), quoted by Ebn al-Nadīm (Fehrest, p. 13), to the effect that the language of Azerbaijan was *Fahlawī* (*al-fahlawīya*) "pertaining to *Fahla*," and that *Fahla* was the region comprised of *Isfahan*, *Ray*, *Hamadān*, *Māh Nahāvand*, and Azerbaijan. A similar statement, on the authority of *Ḥamza Eṣfahānī*, and obviously deriving from the same source, occurs in *Yāqūt's Mo'jam al-boldān* (III, p. 925, s.v. "*Fahlaw*"), and also in *Ḳārazmī's Maḡāṭih al-'olūm* (ed. van Vloten, pp. 116-17).

Next to Ebn al-Moqaffa' 's the oldest reference to *Ādarī*, though no name is given the language, occurs in *Balāḡorī's Fotūh al-boldān* (p. 328; cf. *Qazvīnī, Bīst maqāla* I, p. 145), composed in 255/869. He quotes the word *hān*, meaning "house" or "caravanserai" (Ar. *ḥā'er*), as belonging to the "language of the people of Azerbaijan." (This word shows the development in *Ādarī* of Middle Iranian *x* to *h*, see below.) The oldest mention of the specific term *Ādarī* occurs in *Ya'qūbī's Ketāb al-boldān*, composed in 276/891, p. 272; the population of Azerbaijan is described here as a mixture of Iranian *Ādarī* (*al-'ajam al-ādarīya*) and old *Jāvedānis* (*al-jāwedānīya al-qedam*). By these terms he apparently means the Muslim Azerbaijanis and the *Ḳorramdīnis* or *Jāvedānis*, the followers of *Jāvedān* and *Bābak*, the neo-Mazdakite leaders who had held sway in Azerbaijan under *al-Ma'mūn*. It thus appears that the term *Ādarī* was applied to both the population of Azerbaijan and their language.

The next testimony is the statement by *Mas'ūdī* (d. 345/956) which points to the original unity of the language of the Iranians and its later differentiation into separate languages, such as *Fahlawī*, *Darī*, and *Ādarī*—obviously the most prominent Iranian dialects in his estimation (*Tanbīh*, p. 78). Next we have the statement of *Ebn Ḥawqal* (d. ca. 981/371) that "the language of the people of Azerbaijan and most of the people of Armenia (sic; he probably means the Iranian Armenia) is Iranian (*al-fāresīya*), which binds them together, while Arabic is also used among them; among those who speak *al-fāresīya* (here he seemingly means Persian, spoken by the elite of the urban population), there are few who do not understand Arabic; and some merchants and landowners are even adept in it" (p. 348). Despite the exaggeration concerning the spread of Iranian languages into Armenia and the currency of Arabic in Azerbaijan, the statement clearly attests to the fact that the language of Azerbaijan in the 4th/10th century was Iranian. *Moqaddasī* (d. late 4th/10th cent.) also affirms that the language of Azerbaijan was Iranian (*al-'ajamīya*), saying that it was partly *Darī* and partly "convoluted (*monqaleq*)"; he means no doubt to distinguish between the administrative *lingua franca*, i.e., *Darī* Persian, and the local dialects (*Aḥsan al-taqāsīm*, p. 259). Further he says that the language of the Azerbaijanis "is not pretty . . . but their Persian is intelligible, and in articulation (*fi'l-ḥorūf*) it is similar to the Persian of *Khorasan*" (p. 378). Again he must mean *Darī* Persian, which then, as now, must have been current in the urban centers of Azerbaijan.

An anecdote preserved by *Sam'ānī* (*Ansāb*, s.v. *Tanūḳī*) concerning *Abū Zakarīyā Kāteb Tabrīzī* (d. 502/1109) and his teacher *Abu'l-'Alā' Ma'arrī* refers again to the vernacular of

Azerbaijan in the 5th/12th century. While Kāteb Tabrīzī was in Ma‘arrat al-No‘mān in Syria, he met a fellow-countryman and conversed with him in a language which Abu’l-‘Alā’ could not understand. When Abu’l-‘Alā’ asked him to identify the language, Kāteb told him it was the language of the people of Azerbaijan (read al-ādarīya in the Hyderabad ed., III, p. 93; and al-aḍarbījīya [unpointed] in the Leiden ed.; cf. A. Kasravī, Ādarī, p. 13 n. 1). The statement of Yāqūt (d. 626/1229) to the effect that “The people of Azerbaijan have a language which they call al-ādarīya, and it is intelligible only to themselves” (Mo‘jam al-boldān I, p. 172) makes it clear that Ādarī was still current in Azerbaijan on the eve of the Mongol invasion.

From Zakarīyā b. Moḥammad Qazvīnī’s report in Ātār al-belād, composed in 674/1275, that “no town has escaped being taken over by the Turks except Tabrīz” (Beirut ed., 1960, p. 339) one may infer that at least Tabrīz had remained aloof from the influence of Turkish until the time of Abaqa Ḥamdallāh Mostawfī writing in the 740/1340s calls the language of Marāḡa “modified Pahlavi” (pahlavī-e moḡayyar, as in Dabīrsāqī’s reading, Nozhat al-qolūb, Tehran, 1336 Š./1957, p. 100; the reading pahlavī-e mo‘arrab “arabicized Pahlavi” in Le Strange’s edition, p. 87, is not likely). Mostawfī also calls (ibid., p. 62) the language of Zanjān “straight Pahlavi” (pahlavī-e rāst) and the language of the Goštāsfī province on the western side of the Caspian (i.e., north of the Persian Tāleš and south of Šīrvān) a Pahlavi close to the language of Gīlān (ibid., p. 92). By Pahlavi he, like Ebn al-Moqaffā‘, obviously means in a general way the vernacular of northwestern and central Iran (an area coinciding with ancient Media). This language, however, was not, contrary to Marquart’s view (Markwart, Ērānšahr, p. 132 n. 5) the same as Parthian, as is evident from the written remains and surviving dialects of Ādarī (see below).

These various testimonies, in spite of their being occasionally imprecise and uncritical, indicate that the population of Azerbaijan spoke a major Iranian language, termed Ādarī after the name of the region. It formed a group with the dialects of Ray, Hamadān, and Isfahan and remained the prevalent language of Azerbaijan until the 8th/14th century and probably for some time thereafter.

The spread of Turkish in Azerbaijan.

The gradual weakening of Ādarī began with the penetration of the Persian Azerbaijan by speakers of Turkish. The first of these entered the region in the time of Maḥmūd of Ġazna (Ebn al-Aṭīr [repr.], IX, pp. 383ff.). But it was in the Saljuq period that Turkish tribes began to migrate to Azerbaijan in considerable numbers and settle there (A. Kasravī, Šahrīārān-e gomnām, Tehran, 1335 Š./1956, III, pp. 43ff., and idem, Ādarī, pp. 18-25). The Turkic population continued to grow under the Ildegōzid atabegs of Azerbaijan (531-622/1136-1225), but more particularly under the Mongol il-khans (654-750/1256-1349), the majority of whose soldiery was of Turkic stock and who made Azerbaijan their political center. The almost continuous warfare and turbulence which reigned in Azerbaijan for about 150 years, between the collapse of the Il-khanids and the rise of the Safavids, attracted yet more Turkic military elements to the area. In this period, under the Qara Qoyunlū and Āq Qoyunlū Turkmen (780-874/1378-1469 and 874-908/1469-1502 respectively), Ādarī lost ground at a faster pace than before, so that even the Safavids, originally an Iranian-speaking clan (as evidenced by the quatrains of Shaikh Ṣafī-al-dīn, their eponymous ancestor, and by his biography), became Turkified and adopted Turkish as their vernacular.

The Safavid rule (905-1135/1499-1722), which was initially based on the support of Turkish tribes and the continued backing and influence of the Qezelbāš even after the regime had achieved a broader base, helped further the spread of Turkish at the detriment of Āḍarī, which receded and ceased to be used, at least in the major urban centers, and Turkish was gradually recognized as the language of Azerbaijan. Consequently the term Āḍarī, or more commonly Azeri, came to be applied by some Turkish authors and, following them, some Western orientalists, to the Turkish of Azerbaijan (see EI¹⁻², s.v. “Āḍharī”).

Āḍarī survivals.

These are of three kinds: (1) words, phrases, poems, and scattered verses, recorded in various written sources; (2) the present-day dialects which continue Āḍarī, spoken mainly on the periphery of Azerbaijan to the south and southeast, but also in isolated pockets in the north and the center; and (3) vocabulary borrowed from Āḍarī into the Turkish of Azerbaijan. The credit for first bringing together a collection of Āḍarī survivals belongs to Aḥmad Kasravī (d. 1324 Š./1946; see Āḍarī yā zabān-e bāstān-e Āḍarbāygān, Tehran, 1304 Š./1925). He also sketched the Āḍarī background and a history of the gradual spread of Turkish in Azerbaijan. Although his linguistic observations and methods can not always be supported, his general conclusions were essentially valid and dispelled a widespread notion that no information was available on the original language of Azerbaijan beyond Turkish. (See the reflection of his research in İslām Ansiklopedisi, s.v. “Āzerî,” where Āzerî-Fârisî lehcesi “Iranian Azeri dialect” is distinguished from Āzerî-Türk lehcesi “Turkish Azeri dialect”.) Later, other Āḍarī survivals were detected.

1. Āḍarī in written sources. These include the following: (1) A sentence in “the language of Tabrīz” in Ḥamdallāh Mostawfī’s Nozhat al-qolūb (ed. Dabīrsīāqī, p. 98). (2) A sentence in the “Tabrīzī” language and two sentences attributed to Shaikh Ṣafī-al-dīn of Ardabīl, two double distichs (dobaytīs) probably by him, another dobaytī apparently in the language of Ardabīl, and one in the language of Kalkāl, all of these in the Ṣafwat al-ṣafā of Ebn Bazzāz, a contemporary of Shaikh Ṣadr-al-dīn, the son of Shaikh Ṣafī-al-dīn, and therefore of the 8th/14th century (Bombay ed., 1329/1911, pp. 25, 107, 191, 220). (3) Eleven double dobaytīs by Shaikh Ṣafī-al-dīn, and therefore apparently in the language of Ardabīl, in the Selselat al-nasab-e Ṣafawīya of Shaikh Ḥosayn, a descendant of Shaikh Zāhed Gīlānī, the mentor (morād) of Shaikh Ṣafī-al-dīn (Berlin, 1343/1924-25, pp. 29-33). (4) A macaronic ḡazal by Homām Tabrīzī (d. 714/1314) in Persian and a local language which must be that of Tabrīz (see M. Moḥīṭ Ṭabāṭabā’ī, “Dar pīrāmūn-e zabān-e fārsī,” Majalla-ye āmūzeš o parvareš 8/10, 1317 Š./1938, p. 10; M. Ḥ. Adīb Ṭūsī, NDA Tabrīz 7/3, 1334 Š./1955, pp. 260-62). This specimen differs, however, from the sentence in Tabrīzī given by Ebn Bazzāz with respect to one important phonological feature: In Homām’s poem, the enclitic pronoun of the second person singular is -t, while in Ebn Bazzāz’s sentence it is -r (see below). (5) Two anonymous qaṣīdas in a manuscript written in 730/1329-30 and preserved in the Aya Sofia library in Istanbul (see Adīb Ṭūsī, ibid., 10/4, 1337 Š./1958, pp. 367-417); the dialect of these, judging from their phonology and some of the vocabulary which can be read with certainty appears to belong to the north-central Persian Azerbaijan, probably the Tabrīz-Marand region (see below). (6) One ḡazal and thirteen dobaytīs by Maḡrebī Tabrīzī (d. ca. 809/1406-07; see Adīb Ṭūsī, ibid., 8/12, 1335 Š./1956, pp. 121-27). (7) A text probably by Māmā ‘Eṣmat, a mystical woman-poet of Tabrīz (d. 9th/15th cent.), which occurs in a manuscript, preserved in Turkey, concerning the shrines of saints in Tabrīz (see M. Nawwābī, ibid., 7/1, 1334 Š./1955, pp. 41-44; cf. Adīb Ṭūsī, “Fahlawīyāt-e Māmā ‘Eṣmat wa Kašf-ī be-zabān-e āḍarī-e eṣṭelāḥ-e rāžī yā šahrī,” NDA Tabrīz 8/3, 1335 Š./1957, pp. 242-57). (8) Three poems in the

dialects of *Kamsa* and *Qazvīn*, quoted by *Hamdallāh Mostawfī* in *Nozhat al-qolūb* which, although not belonging to Azerbaijan in the narrow sense of the term, should be grouped with the other remnants of *Āḍarī* in accord with the classification of the modern Iranian dialects of the *Qazvīn* and *Zanjān* areas. These poems consist of a *dobaytī* by *Abu'l-Majīd Bāygānī* in the dialect of an environ of *Qazvīn*; two *dobaytīs* by *Jūlāha* of *Abhar*, apparently a contemporary of *Mostawfī*, in the dialect of *Abhar*, a town in *Kamsa*, and a fragment of nine *dobaytīs*, by a certain *Uyanj* or *Utanj*, in the dialect of *Zanjān*. The text of all three is extremely corrupt (*E. G. Browne, JRAS, 1900, pp. 738-41*). (9) Two *dobaytīs* by *Kašfī*, a *ḡazal* and seven *dobaytīs* by *Ma'ālī*, five *dobaytīs* by *Ādam*, and seven by *Ḳalīfa Šādeq* from a *jong* (a manuscript of personal selections) found in *Tāleš*, and another *jong* from the *Ḳalkāl* area (*Kasravī, Āḍarī, 5th ed., pp. 57-61*). Information is lacking concerning their authors and their dates of composition, but linguistically they are all close to the verses of *Shaikh Šafī*. (10) Ten words from the language of "*Āḍarbāḍakān*" in contrast to Persian, quoted in an old manuscript of *Asadī Ṭūsī's* *Loḡat-e fors* in the *Malek Library* (no. 5839) (*Š. Kīā, "Kohnatarīn dastnevīs-e "Logat-e fors"-e Asadī Ṭūsī", MDAT 3/3, 1335 Š./1956, pp. 4-5; idem, Āḍarīgān: āḡāhīhā-ī dar bāra-ye ḡūyeš-e āḍarī, Tehran, 1354 Š./1975*). (11) Two short *ḡazals*, five lines each, by *Badr Šīrvānī* (*Dīvān, ed. A. H. Rahimov, Moscow, 1985, pp. 665f.*) in the language of "*Kanār Āb*," in a local dialect of *Šīrvān* and possibly the mother tongue of the poet who was born in *Šamāḳī*. The language of these poems is almost identical to that of *Shaikh Šafī-al-dīn's* *dobaytīs* (see below); notice *čaman* "my," -r, the 2nd singular enclitic pronoun (read *mehr-ər* "your love," cf. *ḡam-ər* "your sorrow"), *až* "from," *vī* "without," *kar-*, the present stem of "to do," *vāč-*, the present stem of "to say."

It should be noted that the final section of *Rūhī Anārjānī's* 11th/17th-century *Resāla*, a literary miscellany, entitled "On the Terms and Phrases of Ladies, Grandees, and Dandies of *Tabrīz*" which has been assumed by a number of scholars to be in *Āḍarī* dialect (*Abbās Eqbāl, "Yak sanad-e mohemm dar bāb-e zabān-e āḍarī," Yādḡār 2/3, 1324 Š./1945, pp. 43-50; M. Moḡdam [Moqaddam], Iran Kūda 10, 1327 Š./1948, pp. 1-18; Sa'īd Naḡfīsī, ed., "Resāla-ye Rūhī Anārjānī," FIZ 2, 1333 Š./1954, pp. 329-72; Y. M. Nawwābī, NDA Tabrīz 9, 1336 Š./1957, pp. 221-32, 396-426; M. J. Maškūr, Naẓar-ī ba tārīḳ-e Āḍarbāyjān wa āṭār-e bāstānī wa jam'īyatšenāsī-e ān, Anjoman-e Āṭār-e Mellī, Tehran, 1349 Š./1971, pp. 221ff.; M. Mortazawī, Zabān-e dīrīn-e Āḍarbāyjān, Tehran, 1360 Š./1981, p. 35*), bears no relationship to *Āḍarī*, but as *W. B. Henning* ingeniously realized ("The Ancient Language of Azerbaijan," *TPS, 1954-55, p. 176 n. 5*) refers to a vulgar form of New Persian, and actually attests to the continued currency of this language in *Tabrīz* even in the sixteenth century.

Of the written remains of *Āḍarī*, the *dobaytīs* of *Shaikh Šafī-al-dīn* are the most important: They are relatively old, their linguistic area and their author are known, and they are accompanied by a paraphrase in Persian which helps their understanding. Despite *Ardabīl's* location at the eastern edge of Azerbaijan, in view of its significance both before and after the advent of Islam, its language must have been one of the more important dialects of *Āḍarī*. Before it fell into the hands of the Arabs, *Ardabīl* was the *madīna*, i.e., the metropolis, of Azerbaijan; it was the center of its fiscal administration and the seat of the Sasanian *marzbān* (*Balāḡdorī, Fotūḥ al-boldān, p. 325; Yāqūt, Mo'jam-al-boldān I, p. 197*) and was confirmed as the capital of the region by *Aš'at b. Qays* during *Alī's* caliphate (*Balāḡdorī, Fotūḥ, p. 329*). Some three centuries later *Ebn Hawqal* (*Šūrat al-arḡ, p. 334*) still mentions it as the center and the largest city of Azerbaijan (cf. *Moqaddasī, Aḡsan al-taqāṣīm, p. 375*); *Eṣṭakrī* (*Masālek, p. 181*) refers to it as the largest city, the seat of the government (*dār al-emāra*), and the military encampment (*mo'askar*) of the region (see further *Qodāma b. Ja'far, Ketāb al-ḡarāj, p. 244* and *Ebn Rosta, A'lāq, p. 106*).

2. Words borrowed from *Āḍarī* into Azeri Turkish. These include *dardažar* “ailing” and **kušn* “field”, which occur in Shaikh *Şafī*’s *dobaytūs* (see Kasravī, *Āḍarī*, p. 41). *Kārang* (*Jahān-e aklāq* 4, 1956, pp. 84ff.) notes a number of Tati words used also in Azeri Turkish, e.g., *dīm* “face,” *zamī* “land, field,” *olis*, Azeri *ulas* “charcoal.” But to determine the full extent of such borrowings requires further research. Several authors, notably *Adīb Tūsī* (“*Nomūna-ī čand az loğat-e āḍarī*,” *NDA Tabrīz* 814, 1335 Š./1957, pp. 310-49; 9/2, 3, 4, 1336 Š./1957, pp. 135-68, 242-60, 361-89; cf. *M. Aržangī*, *ibid.*, 9/1, 2, pp. 73-108, 182-201; 10/1, 1337 Š./1958, pp. 81-93) have collected a large number of non-Turkish words used in the Azeri Turkish of the various parts of Azerbaijan (See *Maškūr*, *op. cit.*, p. 263 for a count); but, ignoring proper linguistic criteria, they have taken them to be *Āḍarī*, whereas in fact, they are, by and large, Persian (or Arabic, borrowed through Persian), a fact which shows that *Āḍarī*, unlike Persian, has not affected the lexicon of Azeri Turkish significantly. The assumption of these researchers that the material in the last chapter of *Rūhī Anārjānī*’s *Resāla* is *Āḍarī* (see above) has also tended to vitiate their conclusions. (For a listing of Azeri vocabulary see *Y. M. Nawwābī*, *Zabān-e konūnī-e Āḍarbāyjān* [Bibl.]; and *Koichi Haneda* and *Ali Ganjelu*, *Tabrizi Vocabulary, An Azeri-Turkish Dialect in Iran*, *Studia Culturae Islamicae*, no. 13, Tokyo, 1979.)

3. Present-day dialects or *Āḍarī*. Despite its continued decline over the centuries, *Āḍarī* has not died out and its descendants are found as modern dialects, mostly called Tati, sharing a wide range of phonological and grammatical features. Proceeding from north to south, these are: (1) The dialect of *Kalāsūr* and *Ḳoynarūd*, two villages of the *Ḥasanow* (*Ḥasanābād*) district of *Ahar*; (2) the dialect of *Karīngān*, a village of eastern *Dīzmār* in the *Vazraqān* district (*baḳš*) of *Ahar* sub-province (*šahrestān*); (3) the dialect of *Galīnqaya*, a village of the *Harzand* rural area (*dehestān*) in the district of *Zonūz*, *Marand* sub-province; (4) the *Ḳalkālī* dialects spoken in the chief villages of the *Šāhrūd baḳš* (i.e., *Askestān*, *Asbū*, *Derow*, *Kolūr*, *Šāl*, *Dīz*, *Karīn*, *Lerd*, *Kehel*, *Ṭahārom*, *Gelūzān*, *Gīlavān*, and *Gandomābād*), in *Karnaq*, in the *Ḳoreš-e Rostam baḳš*, and in *Kajal* in the *Kāgādḱonān baḳš* of *Ḳalkāl*; (5) the Tati dialects of the Upper *Ṭārom* (principally in the villages of *Nowkīān*, *Sīāvarūd*, *Kalāsar*, *Hazārrūd*, *Jamābād*, *Bāklūr*, *Čarza*, and *Jeyšābād*); (6) the Tati dialects of *Rāmand* and *Zahrā*, southwest and south of *Qazvīn* (i.e., the dialects of *Tākestān*, *Čāl*, *Esfarvarīn*, *Ḳīāraj*, *Ḳvoznīn*, *Dānesfān*, *Ebrāhīmābād*, and *Sagzābād*) which are close to the Tati of *Ḳalkāl* and *Ṭārom*; (7) the dialects of *Ṭāleš*, from *Allāhbaḳš Maḥalla* and *Šāndermīn* on the border of *Gīlān* in the south to the Soviet *Ṭāleš* in the north, including the dialect of *‘Anbarān* in the *Namīn* district of *Ardabīl*; all connected with the Tati dialects of *Šāhrūd*. This list does not necessarily exhaust the *Āḍarī*-speaking villages of Azerbaijan, and there may exist villages which the writer has not been able to visit, and where Tati is still understood (see *A. A. Kārang*, *Tātī wa harzanī*, pp. 27; he mentions a number of villages in *Dīzmār* and *Ḥasanābad* districts, including *Arzīn*, where the dialect was still understood in the 1940s; on the continued waning of *Āḍarī*, see below).

To the same group of dialects belong in a broad sense: (1) the dialect of *Māsūla* in the *Fūmenāt* district of *Gīlān*; (2) the language spoken in the *Rūdbār* of *Gīlān* (*Raḥmatābād*, *Rostamābād*, etc.), in the *Rūdbār* of *Alamūt* (*Dekīn*, *Mūšqīn*, *Garmārūd*, and *Bolūkān*), and in *Alamūt* (*Mo ‘allem Kelāya*, *Estalbar*, *Gāzarkān*; *Avānak*, etc.); (3) the dialect of *Ḳo ‘īn* and *Safīdkamar* in the *Ījrūd* of *Zanjān*, and a few villages in the *Kūhpāya* of *Qazvīn* (*Zerejerd*, *Nowdeh*, *Asbemard*, *Ḥešār*, etc.); (4) the dialect of *Vafs*, between *Hamadān* and *Arāk*. There are also a number of border dialects, such as the dialect of *Ṭāleqān* villages between *Qazvīn* and *Karaj*, and the dialects of *Āmora* and *Āštīān*, all much affected by Persian, that have close affinities with the group. In fact, the demarcation line between these dialects and their

more northerly cognates cannot be sharply drawn. Kurdish, however, spoken in Mahābād in southwestern Azerbaijan and scattered in several other areas in the region, which some have supposed to be a descendant of Median, does not belong to this group and exhibits some clear differences with it. (See D. N. Mackenzie, "The Origins of Kurdish," *TPS*, 1961, pp. 67-83.)

The fact that these dialects are so relatively abundant and are spoken in contiguous areas over a vast territory confirms their being indigenous to these areas and speaks strongly against the possibility that they spread into Azerbaijan and its border regions from other areas. Their shared linguistic features place them in a well-defined group of North-West Iranian, with affinities with the Central dialects, spoken to the south and southeast of the Ādarī language area. Ādarī and the language termed Fahlawī in the medieval Islamic sources refer in fact to the northern and southern branches of the language spoken in the territory of ancient Media, broadly corresponding to their modern continuations, namely the Tati or Ādarī dialects in central and western Iran (excluding Kurdish and Luri). On the analogy of New Persian one may call them New Median (see further below).

That only meager traces of the language spoken in the central regions of Azerbaijan have survived is only natural, since a language that comes under pressure from other languages disappears faster in the center than in the periphery. The fact that while there are some meager remains of Ādarī from the north, the center, the east, and south of Azerbaijan, yet the western part of the province yields no comparable material, is no doubt due to the dominance in these regions, before the spread of Turkish, of other languages, such as Neo-Aramaic and Kurdish.

The process of the linguistic Turkification of Azerbaijan continues to this day, and even in the border areas the original dialects keep giving way to Turkish. In the course of his study of these dialects in the 1960s, the writer met a number of elderly people who could remember or had been told by their fathers or grandfathers that villages now speaking Turkish formerly spoke the Iranian dialect. In Ḥalab, a village in Ījrūd on the way from Zanjān to Bījār, he met in 1964 the last three men who still retained some shaky memory of their Tati, and in Galīnqaya there was in 1972 only one old man who could speak the native dialect fluently. (See also Kārang, *Tātī wa harzanī*, pp. 27-29; idem, "Kalkālī," *Jahān-e aqlāq* 4, 1335 Š./1956, p. 83; *Dokā*, *Gūyeš-e Galīnqaya*, p. 6.)

Linguistic features.

The absence of vocalization, the deficiencies of the Arabic alphabet in indicating the details of pronunciation, scribal errors, and the influence of classical Persian make the reading of the literary Ādarī remains difficult. Nevertheless they reveal some genuine features of the phonology, grammar, and vocabulary of the language in which they are written. Here the features of two written remains are explored.

A. Shaikh Ṣafī-al-dīn's *dobaytīs*. 1. Old Iranian intervocalic *t* > *r*. Examples: *žir* "life" (< **jit-*, cf. Parthian *jydg*); the enclitic 2nd singular pronoun *-(a)r* (Pers. *-[a]t*); past tense forms: *āmarim* "I came" (< **āmat-*), *bori* or *beri* "he was" (< **būt-*), *šoram* or *šeram* "I went" (< **šut-*), and *žar* "struck" (< *jat-*, Pers. *zad*) in *dara žar* "was pained" (Parthian *drdjd*; Henning, "Ancient Language," p. 176 n. 4). The same sound change is found in two Tati dialects: Harzandi and the dialect of Kalāsūr and Koynarūd; cf. Harzandi *amārā* "he came" (other examples: *vör* "wind" < **wāt-*, *kar* "house" < **kat-*, *jörö-tan* "stranger" <

*(wi)yut-, Pers. *jodā* “separate”); *Kalāsūri* *umarim* “I came,” and *šerim* “I went” (other examples: *zur* “wind,” *jeru* “separate,” *purez* “autumn” < **pātēz* [Pers. *pā’iz*], *zura* “boy, son” < **zātak*-). In other dialects, this change occurs only sporadically; cf., e.g., *Kajali kerom* “which” (< **katām*-, Pers. *kodām*), and in the dialect of Derow in *Kalkāl šera* “he went.” The enclitic pronoun of the 2nd singular is -r in *Kajali* and *Šāhrūdi* of *Kalkāl*, also in *Asālemi* and *Māsāli* in the central and southern Iranian *Ṭāleš* area (but not in northern *Ṭāleši* or ‘*Anbarāni*). In the sentence in the dialect of *Tabrīz* recorded by *Ebn Bazzāz* as uttered by a contemporary of *Shaikh Ṣafī-al-dīn*, we find *ḥarīf-ar žāta* “your contender has come.” One can not measure the extent of this rule in the defunct dialect of *Tabrīz* by this instance alone, but note also the Iranian word *dārdājār* “sick, ailing” in Azeri Turkish, and the Azerbaijani placename *Esparaḳūn*, colloquial for *Safīdaḳān*, a village in *Bostānābād*, east of *Tabrīz*, probably “White spring,” with *espara* < **spētak*- (Pers. *safīd* “white”). The change of intervocalic *t* to *r* is seen also in the so-called *Tati*, but actually (archaic) New Persian dialect of the Iranian-speaking Jews in the *Apsheron* peninsula and the northeast of the Azerbaijan S.S.R. The change, on the other hand, is not effected in the dialects of *Ṭārom*, *Ḳo’īn*, *Rāmand*, and *Alamūt* areas to the south.

2. Old Iranian intervocalic *č* > *j*. Examples: *riji* “he pours,” (Av. *raēca*-), and *navāji* “you [sing.] do not say” (Parth. *w’c*-). The same change is seen in the modern dialects of *Šāhrūd*, *Kajal* and *Asālem*: *Šāhrūdi verijam* “we flee,” *vāje* “he says;” *Kajali mivrije* “he flees;” and *Asālemi bivrij* “flee!” By contrast, in the dialects of *Kalāsūr* and *Ḳoynarūd*, *Ṭāleš*, *Karīngān*, and *Harzand*, *č* has become *ḥ*: cf. *Kalāsūri ruž* “day,” *namuž* “prayer;” ‘*Anbarāni ruža* “fast,” *nəmož* “prayer;” *Ṭāleši* as spoken in the Soviet Union: *tož* “to rush, gallop,” *bad-vož* “defamer, slanderer;” *Karīngāni vuž* “say!;” *Harzandi ruž* “sun.”

3. A vowel phoneme /*ō/ə/* is indicated by the variant spellings -*w* and -*h*: *čw* and *čh*, i.e., /*čə/* “from” (< **hača*, Pers. *az*); and *’št^w* and *’č^h*, i.e., /*aštə/* or /*ač^t*/ “yours” (2nd sing., rendered by Pers. *māl-e to*, lit., “your property”). A similar phoneme is found in the modern dialects of *Harzand*, *Ṭāleš*, *Kajal*, and *Šāhrūd* (not in word-final position in *Šāhrūdi*).

4. Old Iranian initial *j* > *ž*. Examples: *žir* “lile,” and *žar* “struck.” The same sound change is seen in the modern dialects of *Kalāsūr* and *Ḳoynarūd*: *žan* “woman,” *žare* “to hit,” *žāte* “to arrive;” *Ṭāleši žen* “woman,” *žae* “to hit;” *Arazini žen* and *Kajali žan* “woman,” *bežana* “strike!” The form *žāta* in *Ebn Bazzāz*’s sentence shows that this feature extended to the dialect of *Tabrīz*. In the dialects of *Karīngān* and *Harzand*, however, initial *ž* has become *y*: *Karīngāni yan* “woman” and “strike!,” *yaz/yat*- “to arrive,” and *Harzandi yan* “woman,” *yare* “to strike.”

5. Old Iranian *x*, *xw* > *h* in *harda* “he ate;” cf. *sohrāb* “rouge” in the manuscript of the *Loḡat-e fors* mentioned above (*Kīā*, p. 4). This development is regular in *Kajali*: (*hardan* “to eat,” *hāra* “ass,” *heriār* “buyer,” *howlig* “sister”) but sporadic in the *Šāhrūdi* group: *Šāli* (*h*)*ardan*, cf. *Gīlavāni ha* “sister,” *hezə* “he wants” (Parth. *wxāz*-, *wxāšt*, but Pers. *ḵāh*-, *ḵāst*); but *Šāli ḵri*- “to buy,” *ḵes/ḵel* “to sleep,” etc. Cf. also *Karīngāni hārdan* “to eat,” *haraši* “sun” (Pers. *ḵoršīd*): *Harzandi horde* “to eat,” *höšn/höšt* “to want,” *hištan* “self” (Pers. *ḵvīštan*); *Kalāsūri horma* “I ate,” *hāmma* “I read” (Pers. *ḵvāndam*); and in most *Ṭāleši* dialects: *Asālemi hard*-, ‘*Anbarāni hāna bim* “I was eating, used to eat,” and Northern *Ṭāleši hova* “sister“. But in *Asālemi* we find *ženā-xāzī* (Pers. *ḵvāstgārī*), and in the dialect of *Māsāl* in southern *Ṭāleš* we find *xa* “sister,” *xāšk* “dry,” etc.

6. Old Iranian *fr* > *hr* in *ahrā* “tomorrow” (Pers. *fardā* < **fra*-, cf. G. Lazard, *La langue des plus anciens monuments de la prose persane*, Paris, 1963, p. 145). In the modern dialects we find Kajali *a(h)rā*, Harzandi *ohra* (cf. also *heraš/heröt* “to sell” < **frawaxš-/frawaxt*, Pers. *forūš/forūkt*), *Ḳīāraji* of Rāmand *ahrā*, *Šāli pašara* “the day after tomorrow,” *Šāndermīni* and *Māsāli pašerā*, *Tākestāni sarā* “day after tomorrow,” Northern *Ṭāleši havate* “to sell,” *hamue* “to order” (< **framāt*-, Pers. *framūdan*).

7. Oblique case/genitive in *-i (or so-called inverted *ežāfa* construction). This ending is written only in *ōyān-i banda* “the servant of the Lord” (*dobaytī* 11; on *ōyān* < Tk. *oyan*, see Henning, “The Ancient Language,” p. 176 n. 4; it is not a plural of *oy* “he,” as Kasravī thought) but may also be assumed in other cases, e.g., *oyān(i) ḳāššān* “special friends of god,” *čowgān(i) gur-im* “I am the ball of the polo stick” (i.e., resigned to the divine will), and *qodrat(i) zanjir-im* “I am the chain of power” (*dobaytī* 3). Among modern dialects, *Kalāsūri* and *Asālemi* have accusative and genitive in -i, *Ḳalkālī* in -e.

8. The personal pronouns have four forms:

	Direct	Oblique	Possessive	Enclitic
1st	<i>az</i>	<i>man</i>	—	-m
2nd	—	<i>te or tö</i>	<i>eštö</i>	-r

This feature is shared by the dialects of *Ḳalkāl* and *Ṭāleš*. For instance, the corresponding forms in the *Šāli* dialect of *Šahrūd* are:

	Direct	Oblique	Possessive	Enclitic
1st	<i>az</i>	<i>man</i>	<i>čeman</i>	-m
2nd	<i>te</i>	<i>te</i>	<i>ešte</i>	-r

In Kajali the forms are:

	Direct	Oblique	Possessive	Enclitic
1st	<i>az</i>	<i>aman</i>	<i>čəman</i>	-m
2nd	<i>tə</i>	<i>tə</i>	<i>əštə</i>	-r

and in *Asālem*:

	Direct	Oblique	Possessive	Enclitic
1st	<i>az</i>	<i>aman</i>	<i>čəman</i>	-m
2nd	<i>tə</i>	<i>tə</i>	<i>əštə</i>	-r

A similar scheme is found in the dialect of *Čāl* in Rāmand. In the rest of the Rāmand area, however, the oblique form is no longer used. The dialects of upper *Ṭārom*, e.g., *Nowkīāni* and *Hazārrūdi*, have a system of actually five pronominal forms (the pronouns for the direct object and the “logical direct object” in passive constructions are differentiated; see Yarshater, “The Tati Dialects of *Ṭārom*”). In *Karīngāni* and *Harzandi* the direct pronoun has been replaced by the originally oblique form, as in Persian.

9. The 2nd person singular ending is -i in the present indicative (*riji* “you pour,” *navāji* “you do not say”), but -š in the present subjunctive (*mavāješ* “you may not say”). A 2nd person singular ending -š is found in several Tati dialects. In *Karīngāni*, in particular, it is the common form; in *Kalāsūr*, it is found in the present indicative (*bežareš* “you strike”); in *Šāhrūdi* (*Šāli* and *Kolūri*), everywhere except the present indicative and the imperative (*bešiš* “you went,” *age bevrijāš* “if you should flee”); in *Asālem*, everywhere except in the imperative and the present subjunctive (*biš* “you were,” *bebaš* “be!”); in *‘Anbarāni*, in the continuous past tense; and in Northern *Ṭāleši* throughout the verbal system. In *Harzandi* the ending -š does not occur.

10. A continuous present is made from the past stem if indeed, as it appears, the verbs in the fourth *dobaytī* are present tense, wrongly rendered by the past tense in the paraphrase of the *Selselat al-nasab*: *be-koštim* “I kill,” *be-heštim* “I let/leave,” and *na-daštim* “I am not harming” (on the last verb, see Henning, “The Ancient Language,” p. 176 n. 4). The same kind of formation is found in the dialects of *Karīngān*, *Harzand*, and *Kalāsūr*, Northern *Ṭāleši*, and in *Asālemi*, but not in the dialects of Southern *Ṭāleši*: *Karīngāni* *heteine* “I am sleeping” (cf. *fesene* “I sleep” < **xwafs-*), *Harzandi* *bāvāštān* “he is carrying,” *bo-hordān* “he is eating,” *Kalāsūri* *ba-durem* “I am giving” (< **dāt-*), *be-žareš* “you (sing.) are striking,” *ba-šem* “I am going,” *Asālemi* *ba-vindiše* “you (sing.) are seeing,” *ba-bramastim* “we are weeping.”

11. Vocabulary. Note *asra* “tear” (cf. *Šāhrūdi* *asərk*, *Asālemi*, *Māsāli*, and *‘Anbarāni* *asərg*, *Harzandi* *ösör*, *Karīngāni* *aster*; cf. also *ásra* [fem.] in the dialects of *Rāmand* and *ars* in the Persian dictionaries) and *ahra* “tomorrow” (see above, no. 6). The question whether -a in *asra* is a feminine marker (as it is in *Rāmandi*) and whether *Ādarī* of *Ardabīl* distinguished grammatical gender, can not be determined on the basis of the material at hand. Its affinities lie mostly with modern dialects which do not have the category of gender (see below).

It can be seen from the foregoing that the language of the *dobaytīs* is not identical with any one modern descendant of *Ādarī*. Its greatest affinity seems to be on the one hand with the Tati dialects of *Kalāsūr* and *Koynarūd* to the northwest (*t* > *r*, *j* > *ž*, 2nd singular -š, continuous present from the past stem), and on the other with the dialects of the central *Ṭāleš* area to the east (*j* > *ž*, four-fold personal pronoun, 2nd singular -š, continuous present from the past stem), and *Kalkāli* (*t* > *r* in some instances, *j* > *ž* in *Kajali*, four-fold personal pronoun). This agrees well with *Ardabīl*’s geographical position. By contrast, the dialects of *Harzand* and *Karīngān*, the *Āstārā* region, and of Soviet *Ṭāleš* to the north that B. V. Miller (*Talyshskij yazyk*, Moscow, 1953, pp. 253ff.) for lack of information about Tati and southern *Ṭāleši* dialects thought were closest to *Ādarī*, are relatively remoter. (Northern *Ṭāleši* is characterized by the dropping or greatly reducing of unstressed syllables, *t* does not become *r*, the enclitic pronouns are -ə and -əon for 2nd singular and plural, respectively.)

Another conclusion that can be drawn from these comparisons is that *Ṭāleši* should not be grouped with the Caspian dialects, as is commonly done on the basis of their geographical location, but rather with the Tati dialects of Azerbaijan, particularly *Šāhrūdi*.

B. The *Istanbul qašīdas*. The phonology and vocabulary of the language attested in this poem link it with the area of *Tabrīz* and *Marand*. Note the following features.

1. Old Iranian $\bar{a} > \bar{u}$ in $\bar{a}\bar{z}\bar{u}r$ “free” (Pers. $\bar{a}z\bar{a}d$), $\bar{d}\bar{u}r$ “hold!” (Pers. $\bar{d}\bar{a}r$), $\bar{g}\bar{u}n$ “soul” (Parth. and Mid Pers. $\bar{g}\bar{y}\bar{a}n$, NPers. $\bar{j}\bar{a}n$), $*h\bar{u}zdan$ “to ask, want” (Pers. $\bar{k}\bar{v}\bar{a}stan$), $\bar{p}\bar{u}y\bar{d}\bar{u}r$ “permanent” (Pers. $\bar{p}\bar{a}y\bar{d}\bar{a}r$), and $\bar{v}ad\text{-}\bar{n}e\bar{h}\bar{u}d$ “bad-natured” (Pers. $\bar{b}ad\text{-}\bar{n}e\bar{h}\bar{a}d$).
2. Old Iranian intervocalic $t > r$ in $\bar{a}\bar{z}\bar{u}r$, $-r$ “you” (Pers. $-t$), $\bar{z}\bar{u}nar$ “he knows” ($< *z\bar{a}n\text{-}$, Pers. $\bar{d}\bar{a}nad$), and $\bar{z}aran$ “to strike” ($< *jat\text{-}$, Pers. $\bar{z}adan$).
3. Old Iranian intervocalic $\check{c} > j$ in $\bar{j}eman$ “my own” ($< \text{Old Iranian } ha\check{c}a\text{-}$).
4. Old Iranian $x, xw > h$ in $\bar{h}arda$ “eaten” (Pers. $\bar{k}\bar{v}orda$), $*h\bar{u}zdan$ “to ask, want”; cf. $\bar{h}o\check{s}k$ “dry” ($< \text{Old Iranian } *hu\check{s}ka$).
5. Vocabulary. Note $\bar{g}\bar{u}n$ “soul,” $*karend$ “they do, make” (Parth. $\bar{k}ar\text{-}$), $\bar{s}ag$ “stone” (Pers. $\bar{s}ang$), and $\bar{v}\bar{u}n$ “blood” (Av. $\bar{v}ohun\bar{i}$, Pers. $\bar{k}\bar{u}n$).

The position of Ādarī among the Iranian languages.

It is obvious that the language of as broad an area as Azerbaijan could not have been uniform throughout and must have exhibited a variety of local dialects. The statement by Moqaddasī (Aḥsan al-taqāsim, p. 375) to the effect that seventy dialects were spoken in the region of Ardabīl, despite its gross exaggeration, has to be taken to refer to the variety of its local subdialects. On the other hand, the fact that the language of the entire Azerbaijan has been called Ādarī in the early sources and placed alongside Darī and Pahlavi implies that the dialects of the region were similar enough to be called by a single name.

Azerbaijan and the “Jebāl” of the medieval geographers, that is, the mountainous west-central part of the Iranian plateau, coincide geographically with ancient Media and was inhabited by Median tribes in ancient times. Although no independent written document in ancient Median has yet come to light, its fundamental phonological features are known from the Median words and names which occur in Old Persian inscriptions and, less frequently, in Greek (e.g., IE. \hat{g} , and $\hat{g}h < \text{Med(ian)} \bar{z}$, OPers. \bar{d} ; IE. $\bar{k}\bar{u} > \text{Med. } sp$, OPers. \bar{s} ; IE. $\bar{t}r$ and $\bar{t}l > \text{Med. } \bar{\theta}r$, OPers. $\bar{\varsigma}$; see Kent, Old Persian, secs. 8-9; M. Mayrhofer, Die Rekonstruktion des Medischen, Anz. d. Österreichischen Akad. d. Wiss., Phil.-hist. Kl., 1968, 1, Vienna; G. L. Windfuhr, “Isoglosses: A Sketch on Persians and Parthians, Kurds and Medes,” in Monumentum H. S. Nyberg II, Acta Iranica 5, Tehran and Liège, 1975, pp. 457-72). All these features are characteristic also of Ādarī and its modern relatives. Thus there are no linguistic arguments against the derivation of Ādarī from Median, which is based upon compelling geographical and historical evidence (see below), and such a conclusion can in no way be invalidated by the fact that the phonological peculiarities of Median are found, by and large, in all northwestern branches of Iranian, including Parthian, or by the fact that it has not been possible to find exclusive Median isoglosses (see P. O. Skjærvø, BSL 78, pp. 244-51). It will be noted that Ādarī differs from Parthian in some important respects, e.g. “came” is from $\bar{a}(g)mata\text{-}$ (as in Persian) against Parthian $\bar{a}yad < *āgata\text{-}$; Parthian has a suffix $-\bar{i}ft$ and the $\bar{e}z\bar{a}fa \check{c}\bar{e}$ both unknown in Ādarī.*

Likewise, the fact that the Ādarī group of dialects shares a few isoglosses with some geographically and linguistically distant dialects in southeastern Iran, namely Lāri and Baškardi, which, like Persian belong to the South-Western Iranian dialects does not affect our conclusion with regard to the derivation and provenience of Ādarī. The isoglosses shared with Lāri are the 2nd singular ending $-\check{s}$ and the continuous present from the past stem; cf.

Lāri ačedāeš “you are going,” *čedeš* “you went” (A. Eqtedārī, *Farhang-e lārestānī*, Tehran, 1334 Š./1955, p. 269); the isoglosses shared with Baškardi are: *t > r* in North Baškardi (e.g., *zar-* “to strike”) and the continuous present based on the past stem (e.g., North Baškardi *akerdēnom*, South Baškardi *bekert(en)om* “I am doing,” see G. Morgenstierne in *HO I*, iv, 1: *Linguistik*, Leiden, 1958, p. 178). There is no need for assuming any special historico-geographical connection between the Ādarī group and Lāri and Baškardi to explain these isoglosses. Indeed, since Ādarī is phonetically a typical North-Western dialect but Lāri and Baškardi typical South-Western dialects, such an assumption would create more problems for historical Iranian linguistics than it would solve. In the case of other Iranian languages and dialects, too, we occasionally find isoglosses crossing other, fundamental, isoglosses and spanning large distances. One typical case is that of Sogdian and Old Persian (see Henning, *Mitteliranisch*, p. 108).

Historically, Media was divided into Greater Media, which was the area where today the Central dialects are spoken, and Lesser Media or Azerbaijan. Doubtless it is this geographical division which is reflected in the linguistic distinction between *al-ādarīya* and *al-fahlawīya* of our medieval sources. (The fact that while there are some meager remains of Ādarī from the north, the center, the east, and the south of Azerbaijan, yet the western part of the province yields no comparable material, is no doubt due to the dominance in these regions, before the spread of Turkish, of other languages, such as Neo-Aramaic and Kurdish.) Since there is no historical evidence that the population of the Median territories was ever dislocated on a significant scale, or that its language was superseded by any other language than Persian (in the urban centers) and Turkish (in Azerbaijan), the conclusion is inevitable that the affiliated Iranian dialects spoken in Azerbaijan, *Ḳamsa*, *Qazvīn*, *Ṭāleš*, *Hamadān*, *Nahāvand*, *Ḳānsār*, *Kāšān*, *Isfahan*, and *Semnān*, to mention only the chief regions, can be none other than the descendants of the Old Median language, today divided roughly into a northern, Ādarī, group and a southern, “Fahlawī” or “Central” group of dialects.

Bibliography:

Given in the text. The dialect materials referred to in the article, except for the *Ṭāleši* of the Soviet Union, *Arazīni*, *Baškardi*, and *Lāri*, were collected by the author between 1955-72.

See also M. Qazvīnī's review of Kasravī, *Ādarī*, repr. in *Bīst maqāla*, Tehran, 1332 Š./1953, I, pp. 178-86.

On the modern dialects see 'A. Kārang's pioneering treatise on the dialects of *Karīngān* and *Galīnqaya*, *Tātī wa harzanī*, *du lahja az zabān-e bāstān-e Ādarbāyyjān*, *Tabrīz*, 1333 Š./1954.

Y. *Ḍokā*, *Karīngānī*, Tehran, 1332 Š./1954.

Idem, *Gūyeš-e Galīnqaya*, “harzandī,” Tehran, 1336 Š./1957.

J. Matini, “*Daqīqī*, *zabān-e darī wa lahja-ye ādarī*,” *MDAM* 11/4, 1354 Š./1975, pp. 559-75.

M. Mortazawī, “*Nokta-ī čand az zabān-e harzanī*,” *NDA Tabrīz* 6/3, 1333 Š./1954, pp. 304-14.

Idem, Fe'l dar zabān-e harzanī, Tabrīz, 1342 Š./1963.

Y. M. Nawwābī, Zabān-e kunūnī-e Āḍarbāyjān, Tabrīz, 1334 Š./1955 (published earlier as a series of articles in NDA Tabrīz 5 and 6, 1332-33 Š./1953-54).

E. Yarshater, "The Tati Dialect of Shāhrud (Khalkhāl)," BSOAS 22, 1959, pp. 52-68.

Idem "The Tati Dialect of Kajal," BSOAS 23, 1960, pp. 257-68.

Idem, "The Tati Dialects of Rāmand," in A Locust's Leg. Studies in Honour of S. H. Taqizadeh, ed. W. B. Henning and E. Yarshater, London, 1962, pp. 240-45.

Idem, "Marāḡīān-e Alamūt wa Rūdbār wa zabān-e ānhā," Majalla-ye Īrānšenāšī 1, 1346 Š./1967.

Idem, A Grammar of Southern Tati Dialects (Median Dialect Studies I), The Hague and Paris, 1969.

Idem, "The Tati Dialects of Tārom," in W. B. Henning Memorial Volume, ed. M. Boyce and I. Gershevitch, London. 1970, pp. 451-67.

M. Mortazawī provides a listing of the Persian articles on topics related to Āḍarī in Zabān-e dīrīn-e Āḍarbāyjān, pp. 56ff.; of interest is a paper he entitled "Bīst vāza-ye āḍarī dar ḥawāšī-e nosḡa-ye ḡaṭṭī-e Ketāb al-bolḡa" (Twenty Āḍarī words on the margin of the MS. of the K. al-bolḡa) read by M. Mīnovī at the sixth conference of Iranian studies (1974?), but apparently not yet published. On Median and the "Median" dialects see also A. Meillet, Grammaire du vieux perse, 2nd ed. by E. Benveniste, Paris, 1931, p. 7, par. 8; I. Gershevitch, "Dialect Variation in Early Persian," TPS, 1964 [1965], pp. 1-29; P. O. Skjærvø, "Farnah: mot mède en vieux perse?" BSL 79, 1984, pp. 241-59.

On the dialectology of Middle Iranian see also W. Lentz, "Die nordiranischen Elemente in der neupersischen Literatursprache bei Firdosi," ZII 4, 1926, pp. 252-316, and P. Tedesco, "Dialektologie der westiranischen Turfantexte," Monde oriental 15, 1921, pp. 184-258.

(E. Yarshater)

Originally Published: December 15, 1988

Last Updated: August 18, 2011

*This article is available in print.
Vol. III, Fasc. 3, pp. 238-245*